

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/802,551	PHILBRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron C Perez-Daple	2154	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron C Perez-Daple. (3)_____.

(2) Mark Lauer (Reg. 36,578). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5,913,028.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner made a restriction requirement into two groups, claims 1-18 in Group I and claims 19-20 in Group II. Applicant elected Group I without traverse.

The Examiner requested identification of copending/patented applications with claims directed towards a file cache under control of a file system. Applicant identified 09/675,484.

Applicant stated that the claims of the present application are supported only by the present disclosure. Therefore, the effective priority date of the claims is the filing date of the application.

Finally, US 5,913,028 (Wang) was identified as a possible 103(a) reference against claims 1 and 11. Applicant asserted that the "file cache" of the claims is distinct from the local memory of Wang. The Examiner respectfully disagrees because the term "file cache" does not have a standard meaning in the art, and the term is not explicitly defined by the specification.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Continued from Attachment(s): Filing dates IDS forms included: 6/24/04, 6/10/04, 1/10/03, 8/12/02, 6/7/02, 3/29/02, 2/26/02.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY